



KIPP STAR Charter School

**2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 16, 2025

By Brian Choi

625 W 133rd St, New York, NY 10027

212-991-2650

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Brian Choi, Director of Data and Compliance prepared this 2024-25 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the charter school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position	
	Office (e.g., chair, treasurer, secretary)	Committees (e.g., finance, executive)
Kange Kaneene	Chair	N/A
A.J. Fuentes	Trustee/Member	N/A
Dave Levin	Trustee/Member	N/A
Cindy Marte	Trustee/Member	N/A
Richard M. Taft	Trustee/Member	Audit Committee and Finance
Rohan Wadhwa	Trustee/Member	N/A

Carol Martinez has served as the principal since 2024.

Candace Seagrave has served as the principal since 2023.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

The KIPP NYC mission is to partner with families and communities to create joyful, academically excellent schools that equip students with the skills and confidence to pursue the paths of their choosing. This August, we will welcome more than 9,000 students in grades K–12 back to school, while also continuing to invest in support for over 2,300 alumni in high school, college, and beyond. With more than 1,000 dedicated staff members, we remain committed to being an employer of choice, empowering our team to do their best work while driving strong, lifelong outcomes for students. Since our founding, KIPP has been grounded in a shared commitment among schools, families, communities, and staff working together at every level of the organization.

ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year														
School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2022-23	67	73	84	86	85	92	89	80	85	0	0	0	0	741
2023-24	38	70	71	83	81	76	91	94	77	0	0	0	0	681
2024-25	59	52	72	80	85	115	85	101	101	0	0	0	0	750

GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

In Elementary ELA, every student in grades GK–4 is expected to meet their individual growth goal on DIBELS, while students in grades 2–4 will also achieve 100% of their typical growth goal on i-Ready and meet their individual proficiency targets on the NYS ELA assessment in grades 3–4, with overall proficiency goals set at 65% for grade 3 and 66% for grade 4. In Middle School ELA, schools set proficiency targets by grade based on student reading levels and prior years' results, with overall NYS ELA proficiency goals of 65% in grade 5, 63% in grade 6, 71% in grade 7, and 76% in grade 8, alongside the expectation that 100% of students make their typical growth goal on the i-Ready reading assessment.

BACKGROUND

To better align KIPP NYC's goals with the national KIPP network, Fishtank ELA was selected for pilot implementation in the 2024–25 school year, with full adoption planned for 2025–26. This Science of Reading–aligned curriculum was chosen by the KIPP Foundation team based on assessment data and feedback from students, teachers, and leaders to better meet student learning needs.

At the elementary level, schools focused on strengthening alignment between the existing KIPP NYC Wheatley curriculum and the KIPP Foundation Wheatley curriculum. In 2024–25, this work produced a more robust and coherent program, with opportunities for Project-Based Learning (Module 2 for grade 4 and Module 3 for grades K–3). KIPP NYC Wheatley was also aligned thematically and by genre with the

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Writer’s Workshop curriculum, creating a more integrated ELA block. Foundational literacy continued to be supported through Success for All, with instruction guided by DIBELS, i-Ready, and SFA progress monitoring data to inform the Literacy Acceleration Block. Two of seven elementary schools piloted Fishtank ELA to prepare for full network implementation in 2025–26. To support students with specialized learning needs, schools utilized Learning Ally to provide audio access to core unit novels and emphasized the development of integrated co-teaching practices. Teachers also received professional development focused on data-driven instruction and inclusive teaching practices.

In middle schools, students engaged with the custom KIPP NYC Wheatley (reading) and Baldwin (writing) curricula—distinct from the KIPP Foundation’s Wheatley—designed to build authentic literacy practices across narrative, informational, and argumentative genres. Aligned with the Next Generation Learning Standards and grounded in culturally responsive pedagogy and differentiation, these curricula remained largely unchanged in 2024–25, though student-facing Do Now handouts were added using strategies from The Writing Revolution to strengthen the connection between writing and thinking. All middle schools also piloted at least one Fishtank ELA unit to support the transition to full adoption in 2025–26. As with elementary schools, supports included Learning Ally for accessible text engagement and a continued focus on co-teaching. Teachers received professional development centered on effective writing instruction and inclusive teaching practices.

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE ELA

ELA Measure 1 - Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

The tables below summarize the participation information for this year’s test administration as well as the performance of all students and students enrolled for at least two years.

2024-25 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested						Total Enrolled
		Absent	Refusal	ELL/IEP	Admin error	Medically excused	Other reason	
3	63	2	9	8	0	0	0	74
4	73	0	10	8	0	0	0	83
5	89	0	15	12	0	0	1	105
6	73	2	6	7	0	0	3	84
7	91	2	3	5	0	0	2	98
8	95	2	2	3	0	0	0	99
All	484	8	45	43	0	0	6	543

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Performance on 2024-25 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year¹

Grade	All Students			Enrolled in at least their Second Year		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
3	63	59	94	45	44	98
4	73	63	86	63	54	86
5	89	62	70	48	39	81
6	73	38	52	44	21	48
7	91	63	69	71	50	70
8	95	69	73	75	56	75
All	484	354	73	346	264	76

ELA Measure 2 - Absolute

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the State English language arts exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2024-25 English language arts MIP for all students of **117.3**. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.²

English Language Arts 2024-25 Performance Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	PI
484	7.9	19.0	37.0	36.2	183.4

¹ Students are considered "enrolled in at least their second year" if they were enrolled on BEDS day of the school year prior to the most recent exam administration.

² You can find the statewide MIP goals for 2022-23 to 2026-27 [here](#)

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

ELA Measure 3 - Comparative

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.³

2024-25 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	98	45	44	387
4	86	63	46	424
5	81	48	47	466
6	48	44	47	404
7	70	71	51	419
8	75	75	46	478
All	76	346	47	2578

ELA Measure 4 - Comparative

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the target for this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis,

³ Schools can access these data when the NYSED releases its database containing grade level ELA and mathematics results for all schools and districts statewide.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results.⁴

2023-24 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
		Actual	Predicted	
3	83.3	464.0	439.3	2.58
4	87.5	464.0	439.6	2.33
5	94.7	445.0	436.4	0.86
6	90.1	446.0	437.8	0.85
7	92.6	455.0	443.1	1.23
8	93.5	457.0	443.4	1.35
All	90.4	454.8	440.0	1.50

ELA Measure 5 - Growth

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.

METHOD

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁵

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2023-24 and also have a state exam score from 2022-23 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2022-23 score are ranked by their 2023-24 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the target for this measure, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

2023-24 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	52.4	50.0
5	49.0	50.0
6	53.2	50.0
7	58.0	50.0

⁴ These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

⁵ These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

8	48.5	50.0
All	52.5	50.0

ELA INTERNAL EXAM RESULTS

In Elementary ELA, reading progress is measured through DIBELS in grades K–4, with i-Ready ELA administered in grades 2–4 to establish beginning-of-year proficiency levels and generate individualized growth goals. Schools also administer two interim assessments (IAs) during the year, alongside exit tickets and end-of-module assessments in the Tier 1 Reading Curriculum (Wheatley or Fishtank). In Middle School ELA, assessment includes exit tickets, end-of-unit assessments (CPAs), and published writing pieces within the Tier 1 curriculum, supported by internal IAs. i-Ready ELA is administered in grades 5–8 to provide grade-level equivalency, establish growth goals, and monitor progress three times per year, while DIBELS has also been used across schools to track student fluency and phonics accuracy.

During 2024-25, in addition to the New York State 3rd– 8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in ELA:

KIPP STA Percent Meeting DIBELS Goals			
Grade	BOY	MOY	EOY
K	33%	91%	92%
1	62%	78%	87%
2	71%	73%	78%
3	72%	84%	79%
4	73%	76%	65%
Overall	63%	79%	78%

School	3	4	5	6	7	8
% of Students At or Above Grade Level on iReady EOY						
KIPP STA	85%	65%	48%	37%	53%	48%

School	3	4	5	6	7	8
% of Students Making 100%+ of their iReady EOY Growth Goal						
KIPP STA	81%	59%	66%	54%	64%	56%

SUMMARY OF THE ELA GOAL

In Elementary ELA, reading is measured through DIBELS in grades Kindergarten through Fourth Grade, with grades 2–4 also taking i-Ready ELA to establish beginning-of-year proficiency levels and generate individual growth goals. Students complete two interim assessments (IAs) during the year in addition to exit tickets and end-of-module assessments within the Tier 1 Reading Curriculum (Wheatley). In grades K–4, students also take summative assessments at the end of each unit in Wheatley or Fishtank, with

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

weekly sight word assessments in grades K–2 and Morphology assessments in grades 3–4. In Middle School ELA, assessment practices include exit tickets from essential or prioritized lessons, one interim assessment designed to mirror the NYS exam, and CPAs (end-of-unit assessments). Students also complete published Baldwin writing pieces scored with internally developed rubrics, as well as an authentic end-of-year assessment that includes a portfolio and a guided research and writing project—both developed by the 3–8 ELA Assessment Working Group in consultation with current assessment research and best practices. Additionally, i-Ready Reading is administered three times a year (BOY, MOY, and EOY) to track proficiency against grade-level standards and measure growth across the year, while the DIBELS assessment is administered at the same intervals for students performing two or more grade levels below on i-Ready, providing targeted data to inform reading interventions and progress monitoring.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Yes
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Yes
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Yes
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.	Yes
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.	Yes

EVALUATION OF ELA GOAL

In Elementary ELA, 81% of students were reading at grade level by the end of the 2024–25 school year according to DIBELS, with 73% demonstrating at least one year of growth. Notably, 65% of students with IEPs made a year's worth of growth, showing progress at rates similar to their general education peers. On the NYS ELA assessment, 66% of grade 3 students and 70% of grade 4 students scored proficient. In Middle School ELA, schools saw progress on the NYS assessment, with many students moving closer to proficiency targets and reductions in the number of students performing at Level 1. According to i-Ready Reading, 61% of middle school students met their typical growth goal.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

In Elementary ELA, we continued administering i-Ready ELA and DIBELS, with a focus on ongoing professional development to strengthen norming and administration practices and ensure the validity of assessment results. In Middle School ELA, this was the second year of implementing i-Ready Reading and DIBELS. While some inconsistencies in beginning-of-year administration affected certain student growth metrics, these challenges are expected to be resolved as schools gain experience and consistency in the second year of implementation.

ELA ACTION PLAN

To advance our reading and writing goals, we are implementing Fishtank across both elementary and middle schools, while using DIBELS data to guide literacy instruction based on student needs. Daily fluency routines will ensure students are consistently reading and applying multisyllabic word strategies, and a dedicated phonics block in grades K–2 will leverage the Success for All curriculum. Our comprehensive assessment suite—including Reading Inventory, DIBELS, curricular performance assessments, authentic writing tasks, and interim assessments aligned to the state test—will provide actionable data, supported by regional analysis. Professional development will focus on literacy across the school day and on integrating key strands of literacy, while school-based leaders will continue to engage in Looking at Student Work practices and Observation–Feedback cycles to strengthen instruction.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

For SY 2024–25, i-Ready Math continued to serve as the primary diagnostic and growth measure for grades 2–8, with the regional expectation that 100% of students would achieve their typical growth goal, equivalent to one year of content growth. In addition, 50% of students who began the year three or more grade levels behind and were not yet proficient on the NYS exam were expected to meet their stretch growth goals, reflecting the accelerated progress needed to close gaps. For state accountability, regional math goals included 75% proficiency on the NYS exam, fewer than 10% of students scoring at Level 1, and 90% of students meeting their individual state growth projections. At the high school level, benchmarks extended to college readiness and access to advanced coursework, with goals that 75% of students would meet the SAT math benchmark of 530 and that all 9th graders who passed the State Math exam at Level 3 or above would be enrolled in Honors math. Together, these expectations reflected a comprehensive approach: typical growth for all, accelerated growth for those furthest behind, high standards for accountability, and equitable pathways to advanced math opportunities.

Instructional priorities were centered on the theme of “One Year’s Growth in One Year’s Time.” Teachers and leaders engaged in deep analysis of formative and summative data—connecting daily exit tickets, topic quizzes, and interim assessments with i-Ready diagnostics—to identify unfinished learning, design responsive interventions, and monitor their effectiveness in real time. Instructional teams prioritized not only academic progress but also the development of math confidence, perseverance, and problem-solving skills. At the secondary level, this extended to preparing students for advanced

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

coursework and college readiness, with active progress monitoring and evidence-based adjustments ensuring that every student, regardless of starting point, could make at least one year's growth.

Assessment practices expanded this year, marking the second iteration of K–4 math formatives, the launch of new end-of-module assessments in grade 2, and the seventh year of middle school formative assessments. These short, 30-minute quizzes, administered every three to four weeks, provided immediate feedback on recently taught content. Results were submitted in Illuminate, where the regional content team generated analysis reports highlighting reteach priorities, strategies, and upcoming content. Reteach topics were reassessed on the following formative, allowing teachers and students to immediately measure the impact of instructional adjustments. These assessments were supplemented by end-of-module summatives and interim assessments for K–8, which measured cumulative mastery and application across units. Importantly, this year marked the transition to computer-based testing in grades 5–7, with digitized assessments and test-prep materials supporting student readiness for digital engagement in mathematics and problem-solving.

Professional development focused on building teacher capacity to target unfinished learning through proactive pre-teaching, integrate small-group instruction into both core and intervention blocks, and leverage ICT and co-teaching models effectively. Teachers also engaged in active monitoring strategies, real-time data collection and response, and deepened their content knowledge through collaborative lesson and unit internalization with instructional leaders. To supplement instruction, students received targeted practice through i-Ready, Zearn, and Khan Academy, which were also used as tools for small-group intervention.

BACKGROUND

Elementary School Math

In SY 2024–25, all K–4 classrooms transitioned from Eureka Math to Eureka Math² (EM2), marking a significant investment in deepening students' mathematical proficiency by strengthening both conceptual and procedural understanding. EM2 provides coherence across grades, models, and strategies, ensuring stronger vertical alignment over time.

The assessment program was realigned to support EM2 implementation and prepare students for the state's transition to computer-based testing (CBT). End-of-module assessments were required in grades K–4, while grades 1–2 also administered Topic Tickets to provide ongoing formative data. In grades 3–4, a blended model combined EM2 Topic Quizzes with CBT-formatted DnA item bank assessments, building digital fluency prior to the NYS exam. Math Interim Assessments (IAs) were given three times per year across all grades as summative checkpoints aligned to EM2 standards. i-Ready Math was administered three times annually in grades 2–4, while grades K–1 piloted i-Ready for the first time in preparation for KIPP-wide adoption in SY25–26.

Professional development was central to the successful launch of EM2. Bi-monthly Dean Days equipped instructional deans to analyze student work, coach teachers, and strengthen lesson execution. This combination of curriculum rollout, aligned assessments, and leadership development made SY24–25 a

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

pivotal transition year, laying the foundation for more consistent instruction, stronger data practices, and improved readiness for both EM2 and state assessments.

Middle School Math

In SY 2024–25, six of nine 5th grade cohorts and three of nine 6th grade cohorts piloted Eureka Math², a research-based curriculum designed for engagement, accessibility, and rigor, aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards. Lessons followed a four-part structure: Fluency, Launch, Learn, and Debrief, with daily checks for understanding and exit tickets. Remaining 5th and 6th grade cohorts, along with 7th grade, continued with KIPP NYC’s in-house curriculum, refined over the past decade and largely aligned with Eureka’s scope but differentiated in daily objectives and pacing. Lessons included a Do Now, fluency practice, launch activity, guided practice with model problems, and at least 20 minutes of independent work. Eighth grade Algebra students followed a unique integrated curriculum combining 8th grade standards with Algebra I content, preparing them for success on the June Algebra I Regents exam.

To support teacher preparation, all curricula included comprehensive lesson plans outlining key ideas, standards alignment, vocabulary, student discourse opportunities, and common misconceptions. For teachers piloting EM2, weekly content calls beginning in November provided deeper topic and lesson internalization. These sessions highlighted coherence across grades, alignment with standards and NYS exams, and clear expectations for daily mastery.

Assessment practices included the second year of K–4 formatives, the launch of new grade 2 end-of-module assessments, and the seventh year of middle school formatives. These 30-minute quizzes, administered every 3–4 weeks, assessed recently taught content. Results were submitted in Illuminate, and the regional content team provided analysis reports with reteach recommendations, strategies, and upcoming content previews. Reteach topics were reassessed on subsequent formatives, giving teachers and students immediate feedback on instructional effectiveness. These were supplemented by end-of-module summatives and K–8 interim assessments that measured cumulative mastery across units.

To extend learning and provide targeted support, students also engaged with i-Ready, Zearn, and Khan Academy, which were integrated into small-group intervention and independent practice.

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE MATHEMATICS

Math Measure 1 - Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State Mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

The tables below summarize the participation information for this year’s test administration as well as the performance of all students and students enrolled for at least two years.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

2024-25 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested							Total Enrolled
		Absent	Refusal	ELL/IEP	Admin error	Medically excused	Other reason	Took Regents	
3	63	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	74
4	74	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	83
5	96	1	7	7	0	0	1	0	105
6	72	3	6	7	0	0	3	0	84
7	91	0	5	5	0	0	2	0	98
8	0	99	0	25	0	0	0	95	99
All	396	107	34	57	0	0	6	95	543

Performance on 2024-25 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	All Students			Enrolled in at least their Second Year		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
3	63	62	98	47	47	100
4	74	71	96	63	60	95
5	96	50	52	51	31	61
6	72	44	61	43	25	58
7	91	79	87	71	62	87
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
All	396	306	77	275	225	82

Math Measure 2 - Absolute

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2024-25 mathematics MIP for all students of **119.4**. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

Mathematics 2024-25 Performance Index (PI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	PI
396	6.6	16.2	44.7	32.6	187.0

Math Measure 3 - Comparative

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.

2024-25 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	100	47	46	420
4	95	63	44	443
5	61	51	38	487
6	58	43	41	405
7	87	71	46	413
8	0	0	36	275
All	82	275	42	2443

Math Measure 4 - Comparative

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

METHOD

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the target for this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results.⁶

2023-24 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
		Actual	Predicted	
3	83.3	474.0	446.4	1.98
4	87.5	477.0	448.0	1.84
5	94.7	451.0	441.0	0.72
6	90.1	462.0	442.9	1.41
7	92.6	465.0	447.4	1.28
8	0	0	0	0
All	89.7	465.7	445.1	1.44

Math Measure 5 - Growth

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.

METHOD

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁷

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2023-24 and also have a state exam score in 2022-23 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2022-23 scores are ranked by their 2023-24 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are

⁶ These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

⁷ These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

2023-24 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	50.2	50.0
5	40.5	50.0
6	59.6	50.0
7	46.7	50.0
8	0	50.0
All	49.7	50.0

MATHEMATICS INTERNAL EXAM RESULTS

During SY 2024–25, the school employed a comprehensive suite of assessments to monitor student growth and achievement in mathematics. Daily checks for understanding, such as high-priority exit tickets administered two to three times per week, provided immediate formative data on mastery of the daily objective and allowed teachers to address misconceptions in real time. Every two to three weeks, teachers also administered formal formative assessments—approximately 30 minutes in length—that measured critical content and included reassessment items to capture growth following reteach cycles. This assess–reteach–reassess approach created a continuous feedback loop for both students and teachers.

At the module level, end-of-module assessments aligned to Eureka Math² offered summative evidence of mastery across larger domains, while two to three interim assessments throughout the year provided cumulative benchmarks, predicted state test performance, and informed reteach priorities. To further prepare students for accountability measures, upper grade students participated in NYS test simulations and Algebra I Regents practice exams, both designed to replicate the rigor and format of official assessments while diagnosing areas for targeted remediation.

Complementing these teacher-created assessments, all students in grades 2–8 completed i-Ready diagnostics three times per year. These adaptive assessments provided growth measures, domain-specific placement, and early identification of students most in need of intervention. Standards mastery checks within i-Ready offered real-time insight into proficiency on priority standards across the year. Finally, end-of-year assessments in June measured core math skills and concepts while also serving as handoff data to inform the following year's instructional planning.

Taken together, this layered system—spanning daily, formative, modular, interim, diagnostic, and end-of-year measures—ensured a robust and multi-dimensional view of student progress in mathematics, equipping teachers and leaders with the evidence needed to drive instruction, intervention, and long-term outcomes.

During 2024-25, in addition to the New York State 3rd–8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in mathematics:

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

School	3	4	5	6	7	8
% of Students At or Above Grade Level on iReady EOY						
KIPP STA	77%	84%	51%	49%	55%	31%

School	3	4	5	6	7	8
% of Students Making 100%+ of their iReady EOY Growth Goal						
KIPP STA	71%	59%	52%	73%	53%	48%

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

For SY 2024–25, KIPP NYC set ambitious math goals across i-Ready, NYS exams, and Regents outcomes. In grades 2–8, the expectation is that 100% of students will achieve their typical growth target on i-Ready Math, while 50% of students beginning the year three or more grade levels behind and not yet proficient on the NYS exam will meet their stretch growth goals. On the NYS Math assessment, 90% of students are expected to meet their personalized growth projections, which were determined using a combination of i-Ready data and historic proficiency trends. These projections translated into grade-level targets of 70% proficiency in grade 3 (with 3% at Level 1 and 16% at Level 4), 84% proficiency in grade 4 (1% Level 1, 34% Level 4), 75% proficiency in grade 5 (3% Level 1, 36% Level 4), 73% proficiency in grade 6 (4% Level 1, 25% Level 4), and 83% proficiency in grade 7 (2% Level 1, 45% Level 4), with overall goals across grades 3–7 set at 77% proficiency, 3% Level 1, and 31% Level 4. At the high school level, expectations extend to the Algebra I Regents exam, with 100% of 8th grade students sitting for the June 2025 administration, 69% scoring at least 70, and 11% scoring 85 or higher.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State Mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Yes
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's mathematics exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Yes
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Yes
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.	Yes
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.	No

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

EVALUATION OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

During the 2024–25 school year, we launched Eureka Math² in nine fifth- and sixth-grade classrooms, marking the first major step toward full K–8 implementation by Fall 2026. Despite the scale of this transition, overall math outcomes held steady, as reflected in both end-of-year i-Ready growth metrics and NYS summative assessments (administered via computer-based testing in grades 3–7). Compared to 2023–24, elementary school proficiency rose by 2% to 76% overall, with grade 4 improving three points (76%) and grade 3 holding steady at 75%. In middle school, grade 5 increased six points to 64% proficiency and grade 7 rose three points to 78%, though grade 6 declined eight points to 64%, consistent with statewide trends. Against our 2025 network goals, results were mixed: grade 3 met its 74% target (75%), but overall proficiency fell five points short of the 77% goal (71% actual). Still, several campuses outperformed expectations.

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

While we are encouraged that overall math achievement remained steady during this period of significant instructional transition, we also recognize several areas of concern. Our i-Ready growth data, though consistent with prior years, did not reflect the accelerated gains we had anticipated in the early stages of Eureka Math² implementation, a result we attribute partly to the natural learning curve teachers experienced as they adapted to the curriculum’s structure, pacing, and planning demands. The 2024–25 school year also marked the transition of grades 3–5 to computer-based testing, which introduced challenges related to stamina, navigation, and student comfort with the digital platform—factors that may have affected performance despite high participation. To address these challenges, we are expanding opportunities for students to build familiarity with online testing tools and strengthening internal systems to ensure equitable and smooth assessment experiences. Looking ahead, we will leverage the lessons learned this year to enhance professional learning for teachers, refine Responsive Math Instruction (RMI) systems, and ensure that the phased rollout of Eureka Math² leads not only to stable outcomes but to accelerated student growth.

MATHEMATICS ACTION PLAN

At Tier 2 (Targeted Interventions), students identified through formative, interim, and diagnostic data received additional support to accelerate progress. These included EQUIP reteach lessons, small-group instruction aligned to EM2 standards, and personalized practice via i-Ready MyPath. Teachers and deans used interim data and exit ticket trends to flexibly group students around priority skills such as number sense, operations, and fractions, while progress monitoring ensured interventions were adjusted if students fell off track toward typical or stretch growth goals.

At Tier 3 (Intensive Interventions), students with the most significant gaps received individualized instruction in very small groups or one-on-one. Diagnostics identified precise areas of need, and instruction emphasized concrete supports, visual models, scaffolded practice, and intensive fluency routines. Interventionists and special education staff collaborated to deliver these supports, with frequent monitoring to recalibrate instruction and maximize growth.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Based on SY24–25 results, schools prioritized closing gaps for specific cohorts and subpopulations. Students entering three or more grade levels below received additional instructional time and targeted supports with the goal of 50% meeting stretch growth. Transition grades, such as grade 3 preparing for state assessments and grade 8 preparing for the Algebra I Regents, received enhanced supports including practice test simulations, additional small-group cycles, and access to enrichment or honors pathways once proficiency thresholds were reached.

Through consistent, multi-level data collection and tiered, responsive interventions, schools ensured that instructional decisions remained evidence-based and directly aligned to math goals. This approach maintained fidelity across classrooms, established a shared language for progress monitoring, and provided clear, demonstrable evidence of student growth to support renewal.

GOAL 3: SCIENCE

For SY 2024–25, KIPP NYC established ambitious science goals across grades K–8. At the elementary level, the target was for 90% of students per grade band to meet their end-of-unit (EOU) pass rate goal. Within this, 90% of students in grades K–2 and 80% of students in grades 3–4 were expected to demonstrate mastery on EOU assessments, with additional goals of 65% mastery on the grade 2 end-of-year (EOY) Science IA and 55% mastery on the grade 4 EOY Science IA. At the middle school level, the target was again for 90% of students per grade band to meet their EOU pass rate goal, with 90% of students in grades 5–6 and 80% of students in grades 7–8 expected to demonstrate mastery on EOUs. Additional benchmarks were set for performance on the grade 5 and grade 8 NYS Science Exams. To support these outcomes, the K–8 Science instructional priority focused on building deans' capacity to lead effective internalization meetings and foster strong internalization habits among teachers, ensuring more consistent, high-quality science instruction across the region.

BACKGROUND

KIPP NYC's K–8 Science program leverages a blend of Amplify Science and KIPP STEM Master Teacher resources, grounded in a phenomena-based approach where students gather evidence through multiple modalities to make sense of natural phenomena. Students complete three to four formative assessments per unit and a summative assessment at the unit's end, with additional interim assessments in grades 2 and 4 at the elementary level and an end-of-year interim in grades 5–8. Regional professional development for science teachers is provided each trimester to strengthen instructional practices. In SY24–25, elementary schools implemented a new end-of-year 4th Grade Science IA, designed to set a regional benchmark and establish baseline data for 5th grade teachers, aligned to NGSS performance expectations commonly assessed on the state exam. At the middle school level, KIPP NYC piloted computational thinking units in grades 5–8, introducing students to computer science, engineering, and artificial intelligence. These units will expand to all KIPP NYC middle schools in SY25–26.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCIENCE

Science Measure 1 - Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State science examination.

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 5th and 8th grade in spring 2025. The table below summarizes the performance of students enrolled for at least two years.

Charter School Performance on 2024-25 State Science Exam
By Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Students in At Least Their 2 nd Year		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
5	50	27	54
8	74	53	72
All	124	80	65

Science Measure 2 - Comparative

Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the school district of comparison.

2024-25 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Charter School Students in at Least 2 nd Year			All District Students		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
5	50	27	54	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	74	53	72	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	124	80	65	N/A	N/A	N/A

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCIENCE GOAL

Over the past year, KIPP NYC implemented targeted strategies to support progress toward its science goals. Consistent classroom observations and walkthroughs were prioritized, with leaders and instructional coaches collecting real-time data on teaching and learning to inform next steps. Regional alignment on resources and instruction was emphasized to ensure coherence, giving all teachers access to common unit plans, pacing guides, and lesson materials. In addition, Performance Training materials were revised to better prepare teachers for commonly assessed science topics, incorporating short, targeted mini-lessons that broke down high-leverage content areas and question types frequently appearing on state exams.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	No
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	N/A

EVALUATION OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

On the 2024–25 NYS Science Exams, 5th grade results showed 46% of students scoring proficient (Levels 3 and 4), with 4% at Level 4, 42% at Level 3, 45% at Level 2, and 9% at Level 1. In 8th grade, 66% of students scored proficient (Levels 3 and 4), with 13% at Level 4, 53% at Level 3, 30% at Level 2, and 5% at Level 1.

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

KIPP NYC remains committed to improving science achievement during the 2024–25 school year, even as schools navigate staffing and leadership transitions. Through the continued use of the Amplify Science curriculum, aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), we are focused on delivering consistent, high-quality instruction across all grade levels. Key priorities include strengthening alignment and cohesion through standardized curriculum, assessment, and data systems; providing targeted professional development and coaching for new and returning teachers; and implementing responsive, data-driven interventions to close learning gaps while offering enrichment for students demonstrating advanced mastery. At the same time, we are supporting schools with leadership transitions through regional science leader coaching and investing in teacher retention via mentorship, professional growth opportunities, and collaborative professional communities. Together, these strategies are designed to stabilize instruction, accelerate student learning, and ensure equitable access to rigorous science education across all KIPP NYC schools.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Performance on a Regents Science Exam
Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

Grade	Year	Regents Exam	Number Tested	Number Passing	Percent Passing
8	2022-23	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	2023-24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	2024-25	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ACTION PLAN

KIPP NYC K–8 Science is committed to consistent, transparent, and actionable data practices across all schools and grade levels. Uniform protocols for administering assessments, collecting student work, and documenting teacher observations will be paired with a centralized data system in Illuminate, ensuring teachers, leaders, and network staff work from the same information. Regular audits will reinforce accuracy and reliability, while strategic interventions will be guided by ongoing analysis. Teacher support will include professional development on analyzing student work to surface misconceptions and coaching on high-leverage instructional moves. Curriculum adjustments will allow pacing flexibility on priority standards and embed supplemental tasks where needed. For students, targeted interventions will address below-grade-level gaps while enrichment opportunities extend learning for those demonstrating advanced mastery. Progress monitoring will occur through quarterly data deep dives, with leaders evaluating intervention effectiveness, making mid-course corrections, and sharing results transparently across schools to foster collaboration and shared responsibility for student progress.

GOAL 4: ESSA

ESSA Measure 1

Under the state’s ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school’s status under the state accountability system. More information on assigned accountability designations and context can be found [here](#).

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2022-23	Good Standing
2023-24	Good Standing
2024-25	Good Standing

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

KIPP STAR Charter School has been in good standing for each year during the accountability period.